



Leadership Style of High School Teachers

**Dr. A. S. Arul
Lawrence**

Assistant Professor, School of Education, Tamil Nadu Open University, Chennai, India.

ABSTRACT

The present study aims to examine whether there was any significant difference in Leadership Style of high school teachers in terms of certain background variables. In this normative survey study, data were collected with the help of Teachers' Leadership Style Inventory by Arul Lawrence (2012). The investigator has selected 207 teachers who were taking classes for IX and X standard from different high schools in Tenkasi Educational District as sample with the help of stratified random sampling technique. For analyzing the data, Mean, Standard Deviation, 't'-test and ANOVA were used. The findings show that (i) there is no significant difference between B.Ed. and M.Ed. professional qualification of high school teachers in their Leadership Style, (ii) there is no significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Islam high school teachers in their Leadership Style, (iii) there is no significant difference among OC, BC/MBC and SC/ST category high school teachers in their Leadership Style and (iv) there is no significant difference between arts and science teaching high school teachers in their Leadership Style.

KEYWORDS

leadership, leadership style, high school teachers

INTRODUCTION

The quality of the nation depends on the quality and standard of the people. Whereas the quality of the people depends basically on the quality education given by the teachers. Effective education requires competent and quality teachers. The qualities of head, heart and hand mainly constitute the teacher's personality. His intellect, knowledge and thoughts are the qualities of head; sympathy, understanding, fellow feeling, love and affection are the qualities of heart and handwriting, drawing, painting and muscular activities are the qualities of hand. Thus his personality traits, academic achievement and professional efficiency determine his image as a teacher. Teachers in fact are the designers of the future of the students. Teachers are the dynamic forces to include education in students. Directly or indirectly they influence their students, hence teachers should present themselves as ideals. According to William Arthur Ward, "The mediocre teacher tells; the good teacher explains; the superior teacher demonstrates; the great teacher inspires" (Sharma, 1975). A great teacher inspires his students in all possible ways. The teacher is the leader of the social group in the classroom situation as well as in the school life. His job is not finished with the imparting of instruction in the class. He is to develop relation with the class children and make them good social beings, outside the classroom too (Lawrence, 2015). Hence, he / she should maintain good relationship with pupils, colleagues, head of the institution, parents of the children and the community. His vision of life must be based on love, sympathy and affection for all in general and for the needy and deprived classes of the society in particular. So, teacher is considered as a leader (Lawrence, 2012).

TITLE OF THE STUDY

Leadership Style of High School Teachers

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

Leadership style is the result of the philosophy, personality, and experience of the leader. What the leader does determines how well he leads. A style of leadership is a "relatively enduring set of behaviours of the individual, regardless of the situation". Different situations call for different leadership styles. In an emergency when there is little time to converge on an agreement and where a designated authority has significantly more experience or expertise than the rest of the team, autocratic leadership style may be most effective; however, in a highly motivated and aligned team with a homogeneous level of expertise, a more democratic or laissez-faire style may

be more effective. The style adopted should be the one that most effectively achieves the objectives of the group while balancing the interests of its individual members (Lawrence, 2012). Though all the three leadership styles have their own pros and cons, it is important to determine which leadership style is effective over students, so that it will help the teachers to adapt that specific style in their classroom. For this reason, the investigator decided to examine the Teachers' Leadership Style.

OPERATIONAL DEFINITIONS

The investigator adopted the following definitions for the terms used in this title:

1. **Leadership Style:** Leadership style is the manner and approach of providing direction, implementing plans, and motivating people.
2. **High School Teachers:** High school teachers are the teachers who are handling classes for IX and X standards.

OBJECTIVE

- To find out whether there is any significant difference in Leadership Style of high school teachers in terms of certain demographic variables - (i) professional qualification, (ii) religion, (iii) community, (iv) subjects taught and (v) teaching experience.

HYPOTHESES

1. There is no significant difference between B.Ed. and M.Ed. professional qualification of high school teachers in their Leadership Style.
2. There is no significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Islam high school teachers in their Leadership Style.
3. There is no significant difference among OC, BC/MBC and SC/ST community high school teachers in their Leadership Style.
4. There is no significant difference between arts and science teaching high school teachers in their Leadership Style.
5. There is no significant difference among the high school teachers with below 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 21 and above years of teaching experience in their Leadership Style.

METHODOLOGY

In this study 'Survey Method' was employed. Data were col-

lected with the help of Teachers' Leadership Style Inventory by Arul Lawrence (2012). The investigator has selected 207 teachers who were taking classes for IX and X standard from different high schools in Tenkasi Educational District as sample with the help of stratified random sampling technique. For analyzing the data, Mean, Standard Deviation, 't'-test and ANOVA were used.

DATA ANALYSIS

H₀1: There is no significant difference between B.Ed. and M.Ed. professional qualification of high school teachers in their Leadership Style.

TABLE – 1. DIFFERENCE BETWEEN B.Ed. AND M.Ed. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATION OF HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THEIR LEADERSHIP STYLE

Leadership Style	B.Ed. (N=151)		M.Ed. (N=56)		Calculated 't' value	Table 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Autocratic	6.68	4.58	7.36	3.79	0.98	1.96	NS
Democratic	8.38	4.08	8.27	3.54	0.18		NS
Lais-sez-faire	6.94	3.66	6.38	3.43	1.00		NS

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 't' values (0.98, 0.18, and 1.00) for autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire are lesser than the table value (1.96) at 5% level of significance. Hence the Null Hypotheses are accepted.

H₀2: There is no significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Islam high school teachers in their Leadership Style.

TABLE – 2. DIFFERENCE AMONG HINDU, CHRISTIAN AND ISLAM HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THEIR LEADERSHIP STYLE

Leadership Style	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	MSV	Calculated 'F' value	Table 'F' value	Remarks at 5% level
Autocratic	Between	109.63	54.81	2.89	3.04	NS
	Within	3856.58	18.90			
Democratic	Between	44.84	22.42	1.46		NS
	Within	3140.11	15.39			
Lais-sez-faire	Between	22.44	11.22	0.86		NS
	Within	2646.20	12.97			

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 'F' values (2.89, 1.46, and 0.86) for autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire are lesser than the table value (3.04) at 5% level of significance. Hence the Null Hypotheses are accepted.

H₀3: There is no significant difference among OC, BC/ MBC and SC/ST community high school teachers in their Leadership Style.

TABLE – 3. DIFFERENCE AMONG OC, BC/MBC AND SC/ST CATEGORY HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THEIR LEADERSHIP STYLE

Leadership Style	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	MSV	Calculated 'F' value	Table 'F' value	Remarks at 5% level
Autocratic	Between	28.17	14.09	0.73	3.04	NS
	Within	3938.04	19.30			
Democratic	Between	30.70	15.35	0.99		NS
	Within	3154.25	15.46			
Lais-sez-faire	Between	5.66	2.83	0.22		NS
	Within	2662.99	13.05			

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 'F' values (0.73, 0.99, and 0.22) for autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire are lesser than the table value (3.04) at 5% level of significance. Hence the Null Hypotheses are accepted.

H₀4: There is no significant difference between arts and science teaching high school teachers in their Leadership

Style.

TABLE – 4. DIFFERENCE BETWEEN ARTS AND SCIENCE TEACHING HIGH SCHOOL TEACHERS IN THEIR LEADERSHIP STYLE

Leadership Style	Arts (N=97)		Science (N=110)		Calculated 't' value	Table 't' value	Remarks at 5% level
	Mean	S.D.	Mean	S.D.			
Autocratic	6.59	4.48	7.11	4.31	0.85	1.96	NS
Democratic	8.21	3.53	8.47	4.27	0.49		NS
Lais-sez-faire	7.21	3.99	6.42	3.19	1.58		NS

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 't' values (0.85, 0.49, and 1.58) for autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire are lesser than the table value (1.96) at 5% level of significance. Hence the Null Hypotheses are accepted.

H₀5: There is no significant difference among the high school teachers with below 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 21 and above years of teaching experience in their Leadership Style.

TABLE – 5. difference among the high school teachers with below 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 21 and above years of teaching experience in their Leadership Style

Leadership Style	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares	MSV	Calculated 'F' value	Table 'F' value	Remarks at 5% level
Autocratic	Between	15.20	7.60	0.39	3.04	NS
	Within	3951.00	19.37			
Democratic	Between	37.11	18.56	1.20		NS
	Within	3147.84	15.43			
Lais-sez-faire	Between	93.50	46.75	3.70		S
	Within	2575.15	12.62			

It is inferred from the above table that the calculated 'F' values (0.39, 1.20) for autocratic and democratic are lesser than the table value (3.04) at 5% level of significance. Hence the Null Hypotheses are accepted. The calculated 'F' values (3.70) for laissez-faire is greater than the table value (3.04) at 5% level of significance. Hence the Null Hypothesis is rejected.

FINDINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS

1. There is no significant difference between B.Ed. and M.Ed. professional qualification of high school teachers in their Leadership Style.
2. There is no significant difference among Hindu, Christian and Islam high school teachers in their Leadership Style.
3. There is no significant difference among OC, BC/MBC and SC/ST category high school teachers in their Leadership Style.
4. There is no significant difference between arts and science teaching high school teachers in their Leadership Style.
5. There is no significant difference among the high school teachers with below 10 years, 11 to 20 years, and 21 and above years of teaching experience in their autocratic, democratic Leadership Style. But there is significant difference among the high school teachers with below 10 years, 11to 20 years, and 21 and above years of teaching experience in their laissez-faire Leadership Style. That is, 21 and above years teaching experience having teachers (M=7.41) are better than the below 10 years (M=6.26) and 11 to 20 years (M=6.56) experience having teachers in their laissez-faire leadership style.

'F' test result reveals that there is significant difference among the high school teachers with below 10 years experience, 11 to 20 years experience and 21 and above years teaching experience in their laissez-faire leadership style. In laissez-faire leadership style, the teachers with 21 and above years teach-

ing experience are better than the below 10 years and 11 to 20 years experience teachers. This may be due to the fact that the teachers between these ages can give freedom and yet can control the students.

REFERENCES

Lawrence, A. S. Arul (2015). Gender-wise analysis on brain dominance and leadership style of the high school teachers. *International Journal of Scientific Research*, 4(4): 51-52. | Lawrence, A.S. Arul (2012). Brain dominance and leadership style: An empirical style. Germany: Lambert Academic Publishing. | Lawrence, A.S. Arul (2012). Teacher leadership style inventory. New Delhi: APH Publishing Corporation. | Sharma R.C. (1975). *Modern Science Teaching*. New Delhi: Dhanpat Rai. p. 305.